

objection. Reconsideration of the objection is requested. The title of the invention has already been amended once in response to an objection on these grounds which was contained in paper no. 5, mailed August 18, 1999. Since the objection to the title was not maintained in paper no. 8, mailed February 1, 2000, Applicants were led to believe that the amended title was adequately descriptive, and that the objection had been withdrawn. Applicants are confused by the objection to the title being renewed at this late date, and respectfully request the objection be withdrawn.

In the Drawings:

Fig. 5 of the drawings is objected to for not conforming to the specification. Applicants respectfully traverse the objection. Reconsideration of the objection is requested.

This objection was made previously in paper no. 5, mailed August 18, 1999. Numeral 61 was changed to 73 in Figure 5 of the drawings by a Request for Approval of Drawing Corrections filed on November 18, 1999, in response to this objection. Since the objection was not maintained in paper no. 8, mailed February 1, 2000, Applicants were led to believe that the objection had been withdrawn. Applicants are confused by the objection being renewed at this late date, and respectfully request the objection be withdrawn.

The Office Action further objects to the specification at page 17 as referring to 'legends 80 to 89' in Fig. 4. It is submitted that the phrase 'legends 80 to 89' does not appear anywhere on page 17 of the specification. Applicants request the objection be withdrawn.

Finally, the Office Action objects to reference characters 80 and 81 for both being used to designate 'shopping'. It is submitted that reference character 81 designates 'banking &

insurance' in Fig. 5, rather than 'shopping'. Applicants request the objection be withdrawn.

Amendments to the Claims:

The claims have been amended to correct various informalities. Claim 10 has been amended to remove its dependency on previously canceled claim 9. Twice amended claim 46 and thrice amended claim 54 have been further amended to comport with the terminology of originally filed claim 54.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C § 112

Twice amended claim 18 and claims 19 through 22 stand rejected as being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Reconsideration of the rejection is requested.

This rejection was made previously in paper no. 5, mailed August 18, 1999. Twice amended claim 18 was amended to positively recite the features of the interactive picture as larger than the interactive screen in an amendment filed on November 18, 1999, in response to this rejection. Since the rejection was not maintained in paper no. 8, mailed February 1, 2000, Applicants were led to believe that the rejection had been withdrawn. Applicants are confused by the rejection being renewed at this late date, and respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 19 through 22 depend from twice amended claim 18, and were made more definite by the same amendment. The rejection to claims 19 through 22 is also requested to be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 through 4, 6 through 14, 16 through 17, 28 through 30, 32 through 37, 39 through 40, 46 through 50, 52, 54, 55, 57 through 64, 66 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by Florin et al. WO 95/01058 ("Florin"). The rejection is traversed. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Amended claim 1 recites:

"A receiver for receiving broadcast digital television signals representing both image data and information data, the receiver being responsive to the information data to output for display data derived from said image data and said information data and representing an interactive image, and comprising a modem for establishing a telecommunications link, the receiver being responsive to viewer manipulation of an input device to vary the interactive image and to cause the modem to establish a telecommunications link to a remote site for on-line interaction via the interactive image between the viewer and the remote site."

And amended claim 28 recites:

"A method of interacting with broadcast interactive services using a receiver for receiving broadcast digital television signals representing both image data and information data, the receiver comprising a modem for establishing a telecommunications link, the method comprising receiving said television signals, deriving from the data in the received signals an interactive image for display, responding to manipulation of an input device by varying the interactive image, and causing the modem to establish a telecommunications link to a remote site for on-line transfer of data therewith in response to the manipulation of the input device."

It is submitted that neither amended claims 1 nor 28 are disclosed or suggested by Florin (WO 96/01058). Florin discloses an audio-visual transceiver 54 for receiving from a service provider 50 cable television or telephone services over a cable 52 (Fig. 2). The transceiver may also be used in conjunction with other electronic transmission systems such as satellite service systems. The electronic spectrum of signals provided by the service provider 50 includes at least one digital program

listing channel, a plurality of back channels, standard analog TV channels, and additional definable digital channels offering a variety of interactive services. The back channels are used to engage in a variety of transactions, such as ordering products, pay-per-view movies, etc. In operation, any request by a user to view a pay-per-view movie or order a product is transmitted over at least one back channel to the service provider. In the first paragraph of page 31 of Florin, it is stated that the transceiver may comprise additional modules, such as a modem for exchanging digital data over telephone lines. However, Florin does not specify how the modem could be used in interactive services, and it clearly does not disclose or suggest the use of the modem in the way it is used in the receiver of amended claims 1 and 28. In fact, Florin sets out that the data exchange for the interactive services is performed via the back channels of the signal spectrum provided by the service provider, as indicated above. This is in marked contrast to the receiver of amended claims 1 and 28, which cause a modem to establish a telecommunications link to a remote site for on-line interaction in response to viewer manipulation of an input device to vary an interactive image. By utilizing a telecommunications link instead of back channels, transmission bandwidth of the broadcast digital television signals is saved. As stated in the fourth paragraph on page 2 of the description, this is one of the problems of the prior art that the invention aims to overcome. Accordingly, amended claims 1 and 28 and their dependent claims are believed to be patentable over Florin.

Twice amended claim 46 recites: "another broadcast entry level for enabling a user to enter directly a predetermined one of a first, second and third broadcast levels." This amendment finds basis in claim 54 as originally filed and corresponds to entry screen 62 in Fig. 4. As explained in the paragraph

spanning pages 21-22 of the description, the second broadcast entry level, by enabling user to directly enter a predetermined one of the first, second and third broadcast levels (levels 63, 64 and 65 in Fig. 4), allows the service provider to vary the degree of interaction as required. Florin is completely silent as to this feature. Accordingly, twice amended claim 46 and its dependent claims are believed to be patentable over Florin.

With regard to independent claim 61, the Office Action states that page 6 and 7 of Florin anticipate the features of this claim. It is submitted that this is incorrect. Page 6 and 7 of Florin merely set out that the transceiver is capable of displaying a program listing of the current programs available for viewing. A viewer can scroll up and down the program listing or can view a highlighted program on full screen by pressing the "select" button. This function is described in more detail on pages 45 to 48 of Florin in connection with Figs. 12-17. As shown in these Figures, a picture-in-picture window 250 continues to display the currently viewed program which the user was last viewing. However, Florin does not disclose or suggest the feature of being responsive to user selection of a program from a displayed list of programs by outputting signals defining an *image of the selected program in combination with the image of the list of the present programs*, as recited by claim 60. Therefore, claim 61 and its dependent claims are believed to be patentable over the Florin reference.

The Office Action also rejects amended claim 62 and claim 63 as anticipated by Florin. Amended claim 62 recites the feature of a user-operable selector operable to select from a displayed list of channels receivable by the receiver channels for which no information will normally be displayable by the receiver. This feature is referred to as "Channel Lockout feature" in the specific description and is described at page 26, line 13 to page

27, line 27, in connection with Fig. 16. Florin neither discloses nor suggests this feature. Accordingly, amended claim 62 is believed to be patentable over the Florin reference.

With regard to claim 63, recited therein is the feature of a user operable selector operable to select the order in which channels are listed in a displayed list of receivable channels. This feature is listed in Figure 17 and the description thereof. Although Florin describes the display of a list of receivable channels, the reference neither discloses nor suggests the possibility of reorder such a list by user selection.

Accordingly, claim 63 is believed to be patentable over Florin.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejects claims 18 through 22, 41 through 45, and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Florin. The rejection is traversed. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Twice amended claim 18 depends from claim 14, which is submitted to be allowable as discussed above, and adds further distinguishing elements. Twice amended claim 18 and its dependent claims are thus also submitted to be allowable. Claim 41 depends from claim 37, which is submitted to be allowable as discussed above, and adds further distinguishing elements. Claim 41 and its dependent claims are thus also submitted to be allowable. Claim 56 depends from claim 55, which is submitted to be allowable as discussed above, and adds further distinguishing elements. Claim 56 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Further, the Office Action provides no motivation or suggestion to modify the teachings of Florin as required by 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and the M.P.E.P. §706.02(j)(D), beyond the ideas embodied in the applicants' own disclosure. Therefore, claims 18 through 22, 41 through 45, and 56 are believed to be patentable over the Florin reference. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18

through 22, 41 through 45, and 56 is therefore earnestly solicited.

The Office Action rejects claims 5, 15, 31, 38, 51, 53, 65 and 67 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Florin in view of Hendricks et al. WO 94/14284 ("Hendricks"). The rejection is traversed. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 5 depends from claim 2, which is submitted to be allowable as discussed above, and adds further distinguishing elements. Claim 5 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Claim 15 depends from claim 65, which depends in turn from claim 5, which is submitted to be allowable as discussed above, and adds further distinguishing elements. Claim 15 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Claim 31 depends from claim 28, which is submitted to be allowable as discussed above, and adds further distinguishing elements. Claim 31 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Claim 38 depends from claim 67, which depends in turn from claim 31, which is submitted to be allowable as discussed above, and adds further distinguishing elements. Claim 38 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Claim 51 depends from claim 50, which depends in turn from claim 46, which is submitted to be allowable as discussed above, and adds further distinguishing elements. Claim 51 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Claim 53 depends indirectly from claim 46, which is submitted to be allowable as discussed above, and adds further distinguishing elements. Claim 53 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Claim 65 depends from claim 5, which is submitted to be allowable as discussed above, and adds further distinguishing elements. Claim 65 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Claim 67 depends from claim 31, which is submitted to be allowable as discussed above, and adds further distinguishing elements. Claim 67 is thus also submitted to be allowable.

Further, the Office Action provides no motivation or suggestion to combine the teachings of Florin with Hendricks as required by 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and the M.P.E.P. §706.02(j)(D), beyond the ideas embodied in the applicants' own disclosure. Therefore, claims 5, 15, 31, 38, 51, 53, 65 and 67 are believed to be patentable over Florin in view of Hendricks. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 15, 31, 38, 51, 53, 65 and 67 is therefore earnestly solicited.

The Office Action rejects claims 23 through 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Florin in view of Diehl et al. EP 0562295A ("Diehl"). The rejection is traversed. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 23 depends from claim 1, which is submitted to be allowable as discussed above, and adds further distinguishing elements. Claim 23 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Claims 24 through 27 depend from claim 23 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 24 through 27 are thus also submitted to be allowable.

Further, the Office Action provides no motivation or suggestion to combine the teachings of Florin with Diehl as required by 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and the M.P.E.P. §706.02(j)(D), beyond the ideas embodied in the applicants' own disclosure. Therefore, claims 24 through 27 are believed to be patentable over Florin in view of Diehl. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 23 through 27 is therefore earnestly solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the claims satisfy the provisions of the patent statutes and are patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration and early

notice of allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Thomas E. McKiernan

Reg. No. 37,889

Attorney for Applicants

ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, p.c.

Suite 701-E, 555 13th Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 783-6040

Dated: December 14, 2000

104A.AM3